

REMARKS

Claims 19, 27-29 and 38-40 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 19, 27 and 29 are amended. Claims 39 and 40 are added. No new matter is added by these amendments. Claims 1, 3-10, 18, 21, 34 and 37 are canceled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter recited in those claims. Reconsideration of the application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action, in paragraph 7, rejects claims 1, 4, 5 and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,080,450 to Cantor. The cancellation of claims 1, 4, 5 and 8-10 renders this rejection moot.

The Office Action, in paragraph 8, rejects claims 1, 3-10, 18, 19, 21, 27-29, 34, 37 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,372,154 to Li. The cancellation of claims 1, 3-10, 18, 21, 34 and 37 renders the rejection of these claims moot. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Office Action asserts that Li teaches many of the features as recited in the subject matter of the pending claims. However, Li does not teach a multi-layer structure, in which the first material layer, such as the luminescent layer or the hole injection layer, does not include any metal deactivator, as positively recited in the subject matter of the pending claims. Li discloses that the luminescent ink contains at least one organic luminescent material mixed with a solvent and other functional additives to provide the necessary optical, electronic and morphological properties for light-emitting devices (LEDs) (Abstract). Li goes on to teach that the additives play an important role, either for enhanced thin film printing or for better performance of the optoelectronic device. Additionally, Li teaches that the functional additives may be chemically bound to the luminescent compounds or polymers. Li is silent regarding a first material layer to form at least one of the luminescent layer and a hole injection layer, which does not include any metal deactivator. Li does not differentiate that any one of the layers of the

plurality of material layers, does not contain the metal deactivator, as positively recited in the subject matter of the amended claims.

For at least the above reasons, Li cannot reasonably be considered to teach, or to have suggested, the combinations of all of the features recited in at least independent claims 19, 27 and 29. Further, claims 28 and 38 would also not have been suggested by the applied prior art reference for at least the respective dependence of these claims on allowable independent claim 27, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 19, 27-29 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Li are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 19, 27-29 and 38-40 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kirk D. Berkheimer
Registration No. 59,874

JAO:KDB/jam

Date: February 12, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--